

OCT 27 1954

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Administration)

SUBJECT : Letter Efficiency Reports

1. Letter efficiency reports are currently required for Army, Navy and Marine Corps officers when the rater is not an officer of the same service. A number of our officers have expressed apprehension that these letter reports are treated lightly by promotion boards and might injure their service careers. Every effort has been made here to obtain permission to use the regular service rating form in all cases, but to date only Air Force has consented.

2. In turning down our most recent request, Admiral Arnold, Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel, pointed out that "letter reports are to be considered equally as formal, and are to be given equal weight, with the reports submitted on the regular printed form." The same is true with letter efficiency reports submitted on Marines. The Navy and Marine Corps have no numerical system of scoring efficiency reports such as the Army's Officer Efficiency Index (OEI).

3. Instructions to Army selection boards also emphasize that full weight be given to letter reports and the type of duties performed. Nevertheless, only the regular rating form is used in computing the numerical rating. Under certain circumstances this might adversely affect the officer, as the OEI is an important factor in promotion and other personnel actions.


4. In some cases it is possible to render the regular Army report, Department of Army Form 67-3. This report will be scored provided it is rendered by a senior Army officer in the chain of command who has observed the officer's performance of duty, and that sixty or more duty days have accrued (SR 600-185-1). Wherever the existing organization permits, such a report will be rendered in addition to the letter report submitted by the appropriate rating officer.

5. While in theory there is no need for such a procedure for Navy and Marine Corps officers, representatives from the Bureau of Naval Personnel and Marine Corps Headquarters point out that additional reports or commendations from superiors in the chain of command undoubtedly have a strong psychological effect upon the average selection board considering the officer for promotion. Any such additional reports will be incorporated in the officer's file together with the regular report.

6. With regard to efficiency reports or letter reports, the following criticism and recommendation of Admiral Arnold are equally applicable to reports for all services:

"From discussions with officers serving in joint agencies, it appears that at least in some instances a source of dissatisfaction has been a tendency towards perfunctory reports on the part of civilian reporting seniors. This has undoubtedly been due to a lack of appreciation on the part of such reporting seniors of the vital importance of these reports to a naval officer's career and the necessity that such reports be as comprehensive and complete as possible. It is believed that a continuing program of indoctrination of supervisors (reporting seniors) in the vital importance of these reports in naval officers' careers and the necessity that they be as complete and comprehensive as possible will be of great assistance in correcting the situation in the Central Intelligence Agency as described in your letter."

7. Even when security requirements prohibit a detailed discussion of the specific types of duty performed, it is still possible to give a comprehensive description of the officer's qualifications and his manner of performance of duty. It will be particularly helpful also to include an indication of the job level and the degree of responsibility involved. The Military Personnel Division will return to the rating officer any efficiency report which fails to meet these qualifications.

TINTL
Harrison G. Reynolds
Assistant Director for Personnel